

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

Group Art Unit: 3726

Applicant:

DEEPAK K. PAI ET AL.

Examiner: R. K. Chang

Serial No.:

10/765,201

Filed:

January 28, 2004

Title: METHODS FOR FILLING HOLES IN PRINTED WIRING BOARDS

## INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

Commissioner for Patents Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314 Sir:

On this date, Applicants' representative held a telephone conference regarding the status of claim 9. Claim 9 has been rejected under both 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Bahrle and 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Bahrle in view of Official Notice. Applicants' representative expressed that the rejections were inconsistent in that the former indicates that all elements of claim 9 are shown in Bahrle while the former indicates that Bahrle is lacking at least one element of claim 9. The Examiner responded that he considered the obviousness rejection a "fall back" position, in that he considers the application of copper 6 in Bahrle to fill the hole in support of an anticipation rejection, but that such filling would be obvious if copper 6 was not considered to fill the hole as claimed.

Applicants' representative thanked the Examiner for the clarification and noted that he would represent the same in the upcoming appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON, L.L.P.

Date: December 17, 2008

Scott Watkins Reg. No 36,715

STEPTOE & JOHNSON, L.L.P. 1330 Connecticut Ave, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 Telephone: (202) 429-3000

Attorney Docket No. 12492.0274